

Federal Communications Commission

FCC 02-297

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
PR-2-06-2200	Average Interval Completed – DS0	7.38	5.88	7.57	2.5					2
PR-2-07-2200	Average Interval Completed – DS1	8.3	39.5	22.51	7.75					1,2
PR-2-08-2200	Average Interval Completed – DS3	NA	NA	NA	NA					
PR-2-18-2200	Average Interval Completed – Disconnects	6.08	5.83	6.66	5.27					
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-01-2210	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – DS0	9.19	13.64	12.07	0	5.88	0	7.59	0	
PR-4-01-2211	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – DS1	12.04	20	21.43	0	9.85	0	6.74	0	1,4
PR-4-01-2213	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – DS3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
PR-4-01-2214	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Special Other	8.77	0	7.5	0	3.13	0	5.68	0	1,2,3,4
PR-4-02-2200	Average Delay Days – Total	11.7	32	11.49	NA	11.83	NA	8.62	NA	1
PR-4-03-2200	% Missed Appointment – Customer	24.66	12.5	18.35	16		41.18		22.73	
PR-4-08-2200	% Missed Appt. – Customer – Due to Late Order Conf.		3.13		4		0		0	
PR-6- Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-2200	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days	0.67	0	0.76	0	0.63	0	0.42	2.9	
PR-6-03-2200	% Inst. Troubles reported w/ in 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE	0.14	0	0.19	0		0		1.45	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-2200	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0.5	0	0.55	4	6.46	2.94	0.43	0	
PR-8-02-2200	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0.37	0	0.44	0	0.44	0	0.09	0	
Resale (Maintenance) - POTS/Special Services										
POTS - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-2100	Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop	0.95	0.45	1.01	0.42	1.07	0.34	1.26	0.49	
MR-2-03-2100	Network Trouble Report Rate – Central Office	0.09	0.03	0.08	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.04	
MR-2-04-2100	% Subsequent Reports	2.99	2.05	2.96	1.27		1.73		1.11	
MR-2-05-2100	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	0.78	0.43	0.81	0.38		0.32		0.38	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-2110	% Missed Repair Appointment – Loop Bus.	19.08	16.99	19.5	15.07	24.94	23.97	25.22	18.35	
MR-3-01-2120	% Missed Repair Appointment – Loop Res.	13.31	5.66	13.69	4.88	18.19	8.45	16.29	8.53	
MR-3-02-2110	% Missed Repair Appointment – Central Office Bus.	12.97	20	10.82	33.33	11.9	4.55	9.77	3.85	
MR-3-02-2120	% Missed Repair Appointment – Central Office Res.	9.18	17.65	10.71	5.56	12.61	6.67	10.6	15.79	

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-3-03-2100	% CPE/TOK/FOK - Missed Appointment	8.05	4.86	8.4	4.25		5.13		5.96	
MR-3-04-2100	% Missed Repair Appointment - No Double Dispatch	9.17	5.2	9.93	4.5					
MR-3-05-2100	% Missed Repair Appointment - Double Dispatch	40.97	33.33	41.51	36.07					
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-2100	Mean Time To Repair - Total	16.97	11.92	18.91	13.59	23.05	16.18	24.4	16.82	
MR-4-02-2110	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble - Bus.	12.54	12.16	13.73	11.73	14.09	14.48	13.81	13.64	
MR-4-02-2120	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble - Res.	18.35	11.52	20.26	14.5	24.8	17.58	26.32	18.56	
MR-4-03-2110	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble - Bus.	7.23	16.23	8.69	10.97	8.55	9.45	7.76	7.9	
MR-4-03-2120	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble - Res.	10.41	15.06	11.67	11.77	14.24	12.2	15.26	16.93	
MR-4-04-2100	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	80.58	90.24	76	86.42	67.7	79.52	67.85	77.6	
MR-4-06-2100	% Out of Service > 4 Hours	70.97	50.23	71.36	56.78	79.59	58.96	79.12	61.99	
MR-4-07-2100	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	53.93	38.81	55.25	45.48	60.86	46.53	59.28	49.59	
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-2100	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	13.36	11.5	13.25	8.81	12.99	7.05	14.16	12.64	
2-Wire Digital Services - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-2341	Network Trouble Report Rate - Loop	0.3	0.14	0.25	0.55	0.24	0	0.27	0.23	
MR-2-03-2341	Network Trouble Report Rate - Central Office	0.27	0.14	0.22	0	0.22	0	0.29	0	
MR-2-04-2341	% Subsequent Reports	4.55	0	8.4	0		NA		0	4
MR-2-05-2341	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	1.18	1.38	1.26	0.95		0.14		0.46	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-2341	% Missed Repair Appointment - Loop	43.75	0	46.72	50	45.61	NA	45.14	50	1,2,4
MR-3-02-2341	% Missed Repair Appointment - Central Office	27.91	0	15.89	NA	25.23	NA	24.67	NA	1
MR-3-03-2341	% CPE/TOK/FOK - Missed Appointment	22.46	10	21.29	0		0		25	2,3,4
MR-3-04-2341	% Missed Repair Appointment - No Double Dispatch	20.39	0	19.08	0					1,2
MR-3-05-2341	% Missed Repair Appointment - Double Dispatch	58.04	NA	45.56	66.67					2
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-2341	Mean Time To Repair - Total	16.22	2.68	16.49	9.7	18.29	NA	22.94	43.13	1,2,4
MR-4-02-2341	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble	21.83	4.52	20.1	9.1	22.87	NA	29.16	43.73	1,2,4
MR-4-03-2341	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble	9.95	0.85	12.37	NA	13.41	NA	16.97	NA	1

Federal Communications Commission

FCC 02-297

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-4-04-2341	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	80.22	100	80.35	100	77.38	NA	73.81	50	1,2,4
MR-4-07-2341	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	49.51	0	55.56	0	46.15	NA	47.27	100	1,2,4
MR-4-08-2341	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	19.42	0	17.28	0	21.98	NA	28.48	50	1,2,4
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-2341	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	15.02	0	19.21	0	21.27	NA	17.35	0	1,2,4
Special Services - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-01-2200	Network Trouble Report Rate	0.21	0.11	0.23	0.19	0.27	0.37	0.31	0.28	
MR-2-05-2200	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	0.33	0.17	0.32	0.35		0.37		0.57	
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-2200	Mean Time To Repair – Total	5.3	4.48	4.7	4.41					1
MR-4-01-2216	Mean Time To Repair – Total - Non DS0 & DS0					6.78	3.63	5.51	2.84	4
MR-4-01-2217	Mean Time To Repair – Total - DS1 & DS3					6.75	5.92	5.64	2.58	3
MR-4-04-2200	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	99.41	100	99.22	100					1
MR-4-04-2216	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours - Non DS0 & DS0					96.25	100	99.22	100	4
MR-4-04-2217	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours - DS1 & DS3					96	100	99.39	100	3
MR-4-06-2200	% Out of Service > 4 Hours	53.37	50	48.19	25					1,2
MR-4-06-2216	% Out of Service > 4 Hours - Non DS0 & DS0					53.25	28.57	53.63	25	4
MR-4-06-2217	% Out of Service > 4 Hours - DS1 & DS3					36	100	50	22.22	3
MR-4-08-2200	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	0.59	0	0.78	0					1,2
MR-4-08-2216	% Out of Service > 24 Hours - Non DS0 & DS0					3.75	0	0.78	0	4
MR-4-08-2217	% Out of Service > 24 Hours - DS1 & DS3					4	0	0.61	0	3
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-2200	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	10.85	33.33	11.14	11.11	10.44	17.65	14.73	14.29	1
UNE (Ordering) - POTS/Special Services										
Platform										
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness										
OR-1-02-3143	% On Time LSRC – Flow Through		100		99.95		97.85		97.83	
OR-1-04-3143	% On Time LSRC - No Facility Check		98.39		99.15		98.66		98.89	
OR-1-06-3143	% On Time LSRC/ASRC Facility Check		99.29		100		100		100	

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric	Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
			VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
OR-2-02-3143	% On Time LSR Reject – Flow Through			99.54		99.66		99.86		99.87	
OR-2-04-3143	% On Time LSR Reject No Facility Check			97.97		99.08		99.59		99.87	
OR-2-06-3143	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check			100		100		100		100	
OR-6 - Order Accuracy											
OR-6-01-3143	% Service Order Accuracy - Orders			90.72		87.63		93.21		92.67	
OR-6-02-3143	% Accuracy – Opportunities			98.85		98.38					
OR-6-03-3143	% Accuracy – LSR			0		0		0		0	
OR-7 - Order Completeness											
OR-7-01-3143	% Order Confirmation/Rejects sent within 3 Business Days			99.71		99.97		99.81		99.78	
Loop/Pre-qualified Complex/LNP											
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness											
OR-1-02-3331	% On Time LSR – Flow Through			99.96		99.95		99.83		99.5	
OR-1-04-3331	% On Time LSR - No Facility Check			96.63		97.6		98.08		97.39	
OR-1-06-3331	% On Time LSR/ASRC Facility Check			97.5		99.11		98.11		98.27	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness											
OR-2-02-3331	% On Time LSR Reject – Flow Through			99.85		99.32		97.39		99.97	
OR-2-04-3331	% On Time LSR Reject No Facility Check			99.21		99.53		98.96		98.86	
OR-2-06-3331	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check			99.41		100		99.63		99.7	
OR-6 - Order Accuracy											
OR-6-01-3331	% Service Order Accuracy - Orders			98.75		97.14		97.7		96.55	
OR-6-02-3331	% Accuracy – Opportunities			99.83		99.77					
OR-6-03-3331	% Accuracy – LSR			0.03		0.01		0.04		0.02	
OR-7 - Order Completeness											
OR-7-01-3331	% Order Confirmation/Rejects sent within 3 Business Days			99.7		99.78		99.68		99.84	
2 Wire Digital Services											
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness- Requiring Loop Qualification											
OR-1-04-3341	% On Time LSR - No Facility Check			98.92		99.5		99.26		98.67	
OR-1-06-3341	% On Time LSR/ASRC Facility Check			NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification											
OR-2-04-3341	% On Time LSR Reject No Facility Check			100		100		100		100	

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
OR-2-06-3341	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check		NA		NA		NA		NA	
2 Wire xDSL Loops										
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification										
OR-1-04-3342	% On Time LSRC - No Facility Check		97.98		98.98		100		100	
OR-1-06-3342	% On Time LSRC/ASRC - Facility Check		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification										
OR-2-04-3342	% On Time LSR Reject- No Facility Check		100		100		100		100	
OR-2-06-3342	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check		NA		NA		NA		NA	
2 Wire xDSL Line Sharing										
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification										
OR-1-04-3343	% On Time LSRC/ASRC- No Facility Check		100		98.55					
OR-1-06-3343	% On Time LSRC/ASRC - Facility Check		NA		NA					
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification										
OR-2-04-3343	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject- No Facility Check		100		100					
OR-2-06-3343	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check		NA		NA					
2 Wire xDSL Line Sharing & Line Splitting										
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification										
OR-1-04-3340	% On Time LSRC - No Facility Check						100		100	
OR-1-06-3340	% On Time LSRC/ASRC - Facility Check						NA		NA	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness - Requiring Loop Qualification										
OR-2-04-3340	% On Time LSR Reject- No Facility Check						100		100	
OR-2-06-3340	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check						NA		NA	
POTS / Special Services - Aggregate										
OR-3 - Percent Rejects (ASRs + LSRs)										
OR-3-01-3000	% Rejects (ASRs + LSRs)		22.93		22.93		20.58		18.67	
OR-4 - Timeliness of Completion Notification										
OR-4-02-3000	Completion Notice (BCN) - % On Time		95.15		96.57					
OR-4-05-3000	Work Completion Notice (PCN) - % On Time		100		100					
OR-4-12-3000	% Due Date to PCN within 2 Business Days		97.94		98.08					
OR-4-14-3000	% Due Date to BCN within 4 Business Days		96.78		98.18					

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
OR-4-17-3000	% Billing Completion Notifiers sent Within Two (2) Business Days						UD		99.08	
OR-5 - Percent Flow-Through										
OR-5-01-3000	% Flow Through - Total		62.01		69.61		72.22		76.11	
OR-5-02-3000	% Flow Through - Simple		62.46		70.86					
OR-5-03-3000	% Flow Through Achieved						92.21		92.83	
OR-5-03-3112	% Flow Through Achieved		82.71		89.45					
Special Services - Electronically Submitted										
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness (ASRs + LSRs)										
OR-1-04-3210	% On Time LSRC - No Facility Check DS0		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-04-3211	% On Time LSRC/ASRC No Facility Check DS1		100		74.42					
OR-1-04-3213	% On Time LSRC/ASRC No Facility Check DS3		100		NA					1
OR-1-04-3214	% On Time LSRC/ASRC No Facility Check (Non DS0, DS1, & DS3)		100		100					1,2
OR-1-06-3210	% On Time LSRC/ASRC Facility Check DS0		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-06-3211	% On Time LSRC/ASRC Facility Check DS1		74.86		37.68		44.54		87.21	
OR-1-06-3213	% On Time LSRC/ASRC Facility Check DS3		92		72.73		0		100	3,4
OR-1-06-3214	% On Time LSRC/ASRC Facility Check (Non DS0, Non DS1 & Non DS3)		NA		50		100		NA	2,3
OR-1-08-3210	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines -DS0 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-08-3211	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines -DS1 - Fax		100		100					
OR-1-08-3213	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines -DS3 - Fax		NA		NA					
OR-1-08-3214	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines - Non DS0, DS1, DS3 - Fax		NA		NA					
OR-1-10-3210	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines -DS0 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-10-3211	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines -DS1 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-10-3213	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines -DS3 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-10-3214	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines - Non DS0, DS1, DS3 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness (ASRs + LSRs)										
OR-2-04-3200	% On Time LSR Reject No Facility Check		NA		85.71		60		71.43	2,3,4
OR-2-06-3200	% On Time LSR/ASR Reject Facility Check		98.31		75.71		82.5		85	

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
OR-2-08-3200	% On Time LSR Reject < 6 Lines - Fax		NA		100		100		100	2,3,4
OR-2-10-3200	% On Time LSR Reject >=6 Lines - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
Special Services - FAX/MAIL Submitted										
OR-1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness										
OR-1-07-3210	Average LSRC Time < 6 Lines -DS0 - Fax		NA		NA					
OR-1-07-3211	Average LSRC Time < 6 Lines -DS1 - Fax		7.59		21.77					
OR-1-07-3213	Average LSRC Time < 6 Lines -DS3 - Fax		NA		NA					
OR-1-08-3210	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines -DS0 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-08-3211	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines -DS1 - Fax		100		100					
OR-1-08-3213	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines -DS3 - Fax		NA		NA					
OR-1-08-3214	% On Time LSRC < 6 Lines - Non DS0, DS1, DS3 - Fax		NA		NA					
OR-1-10-3210	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines -DS0 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-10-3211	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines -DS1 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-10-3213	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines -DS3 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-1-10-3214	% On Time LSRC >= 6 Lines - Non DS0, DS1, DS3 - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness										
OR-2-08-3200	% On Time LSR Reject < 6 Lines - Fax		NA		100		100		100	2,3,4
OR-2-10-3200	% On Time LSR Reject >=6 Lines - Fax		NA		NA		NA		NA	
UNE (Provisioning) - POTS/Special Services										
POTS - Provisioning										
PR-2 - Average Completed Interval										
PR-2-01-3111	Av. Completed Interval - Total No Dispatch - Hot Cut Loop		4.86		4.98					
PR-2-01-3122	Av. Completed Interval - Total No Dispatch - Other (UNE Switch & INP)	1.42	4	1.21	2					1,2
PR-2-01-3140	Av. Completed Interval - Total No Dispatch - Platform	1.42	1.51	1.21	1.41					
PR-2-03-3112	Av. Completed Interval - Dispatch (1-5 Lines) - Loop	4.61	4.68	4.64	5.28					
PR-2-03-3140	Av. Completed Interval - Dispatch (1-5 Lines) - Platform	4.61	3.07	4.64	1.96					
PR-2-04-3112	Av. Completed Interval - Dispatch (6-9 Lines) - Loop	6.73	5.47	8.18	5.55					
PR-2-04-3140	Av. Completed Interval - Dispatch (6-9 Lines) - Platform	6.73	2.83	8.18	2.67					1,2
PR-2-05-3112	Av. Completed Interval - Dispatch (>= 10 Lines) - Loop	7.63	8.38	10.32	9.57					1,2

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
PR-2-05-3140	Av. Completed Interval - Dispatch (≥ 10 Lines) - Platform	7.63	NA	10.32	3					2
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-02-3100	Average Delay Days – Total	4.11	4.58	3.28	1.69	3.05	4.75	2.77	2.42	
PR-4-03-3100	% Missed Appt. – Customer	1.65	5.54	1.74	3.94		3.98		6.01	
PR-4-04-3113	% Missed Appt. – Verizon – Dispatch - Loop New	7.4	0.54	8.06	0.45	9.36	1	13.48	0.36	
PR-4-04-3140	% Missed Appt. – Verizon – Dispatch - Platform	7.4	0	8.06	0.78	9.36	2.82	13.48	1.37	
PR-4-04-3520	% Missed Appt. – Verizon – Dispatch - Hot Cut Loop	7.4	0.34	8.06	0.44					
PR-4-05-3111	% Missed Appt. – Verizon – No Dispatch - Hot Cut Loop	0.84	0.13	0.87	0.09					
PR-4-05-3121	% Missed Appt. – Verizon – No Dispatch – Other	0.84	0	0.87	0					1,2
PR-4-05-3140	% Missed Appt. – Verizon – No Dispatch - Platform	0.84	0.11	0.87	0.03	0.9	0.08	1.03	0.1	
PR-4-07-3540	% On Time Performance – LNP Only		99.16		99.13		99.23		99.26	
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-3112	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days - Loop	3.6	3.61	3.63	2.61	4.3	3.13	3.89	3.19	
PR-6-01-3121	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days - Platform	3.6	0.98	3.63	0.51	4.3	0.96	3.89	0.64	
PR-6-02-3112	% Installation Troubles reported within 7 Days - Loop	2.2	2.35	2.25	1.55					
PR-6-02-3121	% Installation Troubles reported within 7 Days - Platform	2.2	0.46	2.25	0.16					
PR-6-02-3520	% Installation Troubles reported within 7 Days - Hot Cut Loop		0		0.66		0.9		0.61	
PR-6-03-3112	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE – Loop	3.12	3.88	3.21	3.58		3.1		4.29	
PR-6-03-3121	% Inst. Troubles reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE – Platform	3.12	0.92	3.21	0.86		1.39		0.91	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-3100	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.03	0	
PR-8-02-3100	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0	
Hot Cuts										
PR-9 - Hot Cut Loops										
PR-9-01-3520	% On Time Performance – Hot Cut Loop		98.62		99.14		98.58		98.59	
PR-9-02-3520	% Early Cuts - Lines		0.28		0.66		0.5		0.04	
PR-9-08-3520	Average Duration of Service Interruption		NA		11.73		10.23		18.6	
2-Wire Digital Services										

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
PR-2 - Average Completed Interval										
PR-2-01-3341	Av. Interval Completed – Total No Dispatch	1.47	1	1.43	4					1,2
PR-2-02-3341	Av. Interval Completed – Total Dispatch	4.23	4.81	3.91	5.42					
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-02-3341	Average Delay Days – Total	6.23	1.5	4.26	3.63	13.51	1.25	32.37	2.45	1,2,3
PR-4-03-3341	% Missed Appointment – Customer	8.18	6.06	6.9	5.97		3.77		9.09	
PR-4-04-3341	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Dispatch	9.09	1.57	5.92	4.07	6.74	1	7.2	2.7	
PR-4-05-3341	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – No Dispatch	1.04	0	1.13	25	2.61	0	1.23	12.5	1,2,3,4
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-3341	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days	6.9	8.09	3.07	6.57	6.12	2.7	6.28	2.96	
PR-6-03-3341	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE	6.68	8.82	7.78	5.84		5.41		8.15	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-3341	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0	0	0.1	0	0.17	0	0	0	
PR-8-02-3341	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2-Wire xDSL Loops										
PR-2 - Average Completed Interval										
PR-2-01-3342	Av. Interval Completed – Total No Dispatch		6.64		5.42					
PR-2-02-3342	Av. Interval Completed – Total Dispatch		5.36		5.99					
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-02-3342	Average Delay Days – Total	10.55	3.17	8.88	2.56	15	2.43	8.58	2	1,3,4
PR-4-03-3342	% Missed Appointment – Customer	0.86	7.48	0.52	5.93		6.22		6.25	
PR-4-04-3342	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Dispatch		0		0.8		0.56		1.39	
PR-4-14-3342	% Completed On Time [With Serial Number]		NA		NA		99.09		98.31	
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-3342	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days	7.43	7.07	5.18	2.22	6.12	5.18	6.28	5.45	
PR-6-03-3342	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE	3.12	7.27	3.21	8.37		6.99		6.23	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-3342	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0.54	0	0.65	0	6.97	0	0.33	0	
PR-8-02-3342	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0.36	0	0.43	0	0.31	0	0	0	
2-Wire xDSL Line Sharing										

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
PR-2 - Average Completed Interval										
PR-2-01-3343	Av. Interval Completed – Total No Dispatch	3.04	2.53	3	3.02					
PR-2-02-3343	Av. Interval Completed – Total Dispatch	2.84	2.85	2.98	2.91					
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-02-3343	Average Delay Days – Total	2.41	4	1.29	2	1.5	2	1.14	7.13	1,2,3,4
PR-4-03-3343	% Missed Appointment – Customer	0.86	3.92	0.52	1.71		2.05		3.52	
PR-4-04-3343	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Dispatch	0.86	0	0.85	0	1.37	7.32	1.62	1.75	
PR-4-05-3343	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – No Dispatch	1.03	0.93	1	0.47	0.52	1.01	0.52	0.99	
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-3343	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days	0.65	0.65	0.77	2.05	0.77	0.82	1.05	1.9	
PR-6-03-3343	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE	4.26	3.92	5.53	5.12		5.74		3.79	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-3343	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PR-8-02-3343	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2-Wire xDSL Line Splitting										
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-03-3345	% Missed Appointment – Customer						NA		NA	
PR-4-04-3345	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Dispatch					1.37	NA	1.62	NA	
PR-4-05-3345	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – No Dispatch					0.52	NA	0.52	NA	
PR-5 - Facility Missed Orders										
PR-5-01-3345	% Missed Appointment - Verizon Facilities					2.11	NA	1.37	NA	
PR-5-02-3345	% Orders Held for Facilities > 15 Days					0	NA	0	NA	
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-3345	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days					0.77	NA	1.05	NA	
PR-6-03-3345	% Install. Troubles Reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE						NA		NA	
Special Services - Provisioning										
PR-2 - Average Completed Interval										
PR-2-01-3200	Av. Interval Completed – Total No Dispatch	6.07	7.91	15.74	6.9					
PR-2-02-3200	Av. Interval Completed – Total Dispatch	8.46	14	13.28	11.93					
PR-2-06-3200	Av. Interval Completed – DSO	7.38	10	7.57	NA					1

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
PR-2-07-3200	Av. Interval Completed – DS1	8.3	14.18	22.51	12.17					
PR-2-08-3200	Av. Interval Completed – DS3	NA	NA	NA	NA					
PR-2-09-3511	Av. Interval Completed – Total - EEL - Backbone		NA		NA					
PR-2-09-3512	Av. Interval Completed – Total - EEL – Loop		NA		NA					
PR-4 - Missed Appointments										
PR-4-01-3210	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – DS0	9.19	NA	12.07	NA	5.88	NA	7.59	NA	
PR-4-01-3211	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – DS1	12.04	6.27	21.43	4.11	6.36	4.26	7.02	5.06	
PR-4-01-3213	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – DS3	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	2
PR-4-01-3214	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Special Other					3.13	NA	5.68	NA	
PR-4-01-3215	% Missed Appointment – Verizon –Special Other	8.77	NA	7.5	NA					
PR-4-01-3510	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Total - EEL	12.04	NA	21.43	NA	6.36	NA	7.02	NA	
PR-4-01-3530	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Total- IOF	NA	0	NA	0	NA	20	NA	33.33	3,4
PR-4-02-3200	Average Delay Days – Total	11.7	3.96	11.49	1.83	11.83	2.25	8.62	2.63	2,3,4
PR-4-02-3510	Average Delay Days – Total - EEL	15.04	NA	13.53	NA	7.36	NA	11.92	NA	
PR-4-02-3530	Average Delay Days – Total - IOF	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	7	3,4
PR-4-03-3200	% Missed Appointment – Customer	24.66	2.51	18.35	2.2		6.91		3.05	
PR-4-03-3510	% Missed Appointment – Customer - EEL	20.42	NA	7.64	NA		NA		0	4
PR-4-03-3530	% Missed Appointment – Customer - IOF						0		0	3,4
PR-4-07-3540	% On Time Performance – LNP Only		99.16		99.13		99.23		99.26	
PR-4-08-3200	% Missed Appt. – Customer – Late Order Conf.		2.01		0		4.32		1.57	
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-3200	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days	0.67	3.15	0.76	11.22	0.63	5.28	0.42	5.59	
PR-6-03-3200	% Inst. Troubles reported w/ in 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE	0.14	0.35	0.19	0.51		0		6.13	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-3200	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0.5	0	0.55	0	6.46	0	0.43	0.02	
PR-8-02-3200	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0.37	0	0.44	0	0.44	0	0.09	0.02	
Maintenance - POTS Loop										
MR-2 -Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-3550	Network Trouble Report Rate – Loop	n.95	0.65	1.01	0.61	1.07	0.52	1.26	0.58	

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-2-03-3550	Network Trouble Report Rate – Central Office	0.09	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.05	
MR-2-05-3550	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	0.78	0.69	0.81	0.73		0.57		0.62	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-3550	% Missed Repair Appointment – Loop	14.04	3.25	14.42	1.85	18.97	3.08	17.29	6.66	
MR-3-02-3550	% Missed Repair Appointment – Central Office	10.27	4.9	10.77	4.88	12.38	9.09	10.42	11.63	
MR-3-03-3550	% CPE/TOK/FOK - Missed Appointment	8.05	2.15	8.4	2.31		2.42		4.23	
MR-3-04-3550	% Missed Repair Appointment - No Double Dispatch	9.17	1.5	9.93	1.02					
MR-3-05-3550	% Missed Repair Appointment - Double Dispatch	40.97	12	41.51	10.37					
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-3550	Mean Time To Repair – Total	16.97	13.18	18.91	12.16	23.05	12.23	24.4	14.89	
MR-4-02-3550	Mean Time To Repair – Loop Trouble	17.72	13.21	19.54	12.31	23.65	12.17	25	14.92	
MR-4-03-3550	Mean Time To Repair – Central Office Trouble	9.56	12.82	10.83	10.07	12.71	10.22	13.59	14.57	
MR-4-04-3550	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	80.58	91.98	76	92.27	67.7	92.04	67.85	87.9	
MR-4-07-3550	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	53.93	49.13	55.25	48.18	60.86	47.5	59.28	49.42	
MR-4-08-3550	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	18.5	8.95	22.15	7.39	29.76	8.27	29.11	12.21	
MR-4-09-3550	Mean Time To Repair - No Double Dispatch	15.41	11.52	17.59	11.27					
MR-4-10-3550	Mean Time To Repair - Double Dispatch	29.47	21.59	31.64	21.73					
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3550	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	13.36	16.04	13.25	18.71	12.99	11.64	14.16	14.3	
Maintenance - POTS Platform										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-3140	Network Trouble Report Rate – Platform	0.95	0.71	1.01	0.6	1.07	0.62	1.26	0.78	
MR-2-03-3140	Network Trouble Report Rate – Central Office	0.09	0.13	0.08	0.1	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.08	
MR-2-04-3140	% Subsequent Reports	2.99	3.7	2.96	5.07		3.75		0.49	
MR-2-05-3140	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	0.78	0.92	0.81	0.75		0.89		1	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-3144	% Missed Repair Appointment – Platform Bus.	19.08	15.63	19.5	8.62	24.94	18.97	25.22	16.28	
MR-3-01-3145	% Missed Repair Appointment – Platform Res.	13.31	4.17	13.69	3.7	18.19	16.44	16.29	8.25	
MR-3-02-3144	% Missed Repair Appointment – Central Office Bus.	12.97	30.77	10.82	0	11.9	16.67	9.77	0	2
MR-3-02-3145	% Missed Repair Appointment – Central Office Res.	9.18	0	10.71	8.33	12.61	27.27	10.6	0	1,4

Federal Communications Commission

FCC 02-297

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-3-03-3140	% CPE/TOK/FOK - Missed Appointment - Platform	8.05	11.4	8.4	7.86		13.37		12.77	
MR-3-04-3140	% Missed Repair Appointment - No Double Dispatch	9.17	12.22	9.93	2.83					
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-3140	Mean Time To Repair – Total	16.97	12.03	18.91	14.83	23.05	21.03	24.4	17.22	
MR-4-04-3140	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	80.58	91.35	76	84.73	67.7	72.73	67.85	82.18	
MR-4-06-3140	% Out of Service > 4 Hours	70.97	56.45	71.36	58.33	79.59	73.08	79.12	65.22	
MR-4-07-3140	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	53.93	48.39	55.25	43.06	60.86	58.65	59.28	47.83	
MR-4-08-3144	% Out of Service > 24 Hours - Bus.	10.1	7.5	11.88	5.56	14.61	5	13.22	6.67	
MR-4-08-3145	% Out of Service > 24 Hours - Res.	19.68	9.09	23.58	19.44	31.67	39.06	31.01	19.23	
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3140	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	13.36	8.65	13.25	12.98	12.99	9.74	14.16	12.87	
2-Wire Digital Services - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-3341	Network Trouble Report Rate - Loop	0.3	0.9	0.25	0.66	1.06	0.7	1.23	0.51	
MR-2-03-3341	Network Trouble Report Rate - Central Office	0.27	0.05	0.22	0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.13	
MR-2-04-3341	% Subsequent Reports	4.55	0	8.4	0		0		0	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-3341	% Missed Repair Appointment – Loop	43.75	5.88	46.72	13.89	19.06	5.26	17.4	10.71	
MR-3-02-3341	% Missed Repair Appointment – Central Office	27.91	0	15.89	0	13.05	25	11.37	0	1,2,3,4
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-3341	Mean Time To Repair - Total	16.22	22.19	16.49	19.97	23.02	15.62	24.39	15.75	
MR-4-02-3341	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble	21.83	23.1	20.1	21.38	23.65	15.82	25.02	17.08	
MR-4-03-3341	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble	9.95	6.74	12.37	9.84	12.74	13.72	13.81	10.44	1,2,3,4
MR-4-07-3341	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	49.51	68.75	55.56	70	60.8	57.14	59.2	44.44	
MR-4-08-3341	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	19.42	25	17.28	23.33	29.73	14.29	29.1	18.52	
MR-4-09-3341	Mean Time To Repair - No Double Dispatch	10.47	18.13	11.3	18.62					
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3341	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	15.02	18.52	19.21	12.2	13.04	21.43	14.18	25.71	
2-Wire xDSL Loops - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-2-02-3342	Network Trouble Report Rate - Loop	0.12	0.31	0.13	0.3	1.06	0.33	1.23	0.38	
MR-2-03-3342	Network Trouble Report Rate - Central Office	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.01	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-3342	% Missed Repair Appointment - Loop	18.97	4.08	24.64	2.35	19.06	1.12	17.4	6.93	
MR-3-02-3342	% Missed Repair Appointment - Central Office	7.69	0	19.51	5.26	13.05	0	11.37	0	4
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-02-3342	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble	27.67	16.68	28.77	14.33	23.65	11.82	25.02	16.34	
MR-4-03-3342	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble	14.29	5.16	22.56	6.88	12.74	2.18	13.81	5.05	4
MR-4-07-3342	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	74.71	39.08	83.18	42.86	60.8	42.11	59.2	53.57	
MR-4-08-3342	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	27.59	18.39	38.32	10.39	29.73	2.63	29.1	21.43	
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3342	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	48.45	21.43	46.36	17.31	13.04	21.43	14.18	19.44	
2-Wire xDSL Line Sharing - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-3343	Network Trouble Report Rate - Loop	0.12	0	0.13	0.08	0.22	0.16	0.23	0.22	
MR-2-03-3343	Network Trouble Report Rate - Central Office	0.03	0	0.04	0	0.04	0.08	0.05	0.04	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-3343	% Missed Repair Appointment - Loop	18.97	0	24.64	0	29.17	25	40.65	40	1,2,3
MR-3-02-3343	% Missed Repair Appointment - Central Office	7.69	0	19.51	0	13.79	0	11.11	0	1,2,3,4
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-02-3343	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble	27.67	8.15	28.77	18.54	31.35	20.4	46.81	25.91	1,2,3
MR-4-03-3343	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble	14.29	1.75	22.56	14.02	15.15	4.28	18.36	2.58	1,2,3,4
MR-4-04-3343	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	69.07	100	60.91	75	59.06	87.5	44.51	50	1,2,3
MR-4-07-3343	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	74.71	0	83.18	66.67	78.36	42.86	82.58	63.64	1,2,3
MR-4-08-3343	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	27.59	0	38.32	16.67	39.55	14.29	56.13	63.64	1,2,3
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3343	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	48.45	0	46.36	25	34.9	50	36.81	14.29	1,2,3
2-Wire xDSL Line Splitting - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-02-3345	Network Trouble Report Rate - Loop					0.22	NA	0.23	NA	

Federal Communications Commission

FCC 02-297

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-2-03-3345	Network Trouble Report Rate - Central Office					0.04	NA	0.05	NA	
MR-2-04-3345	% Subsequent Reports					0	NA	0	NA	
MR-2-05-3345	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate					NA	NA	NA	NA	
MR-3 - Missed Repair Appointments										
MR-3-01-3345	% Missed Repair Appointment - Loop					29.17	NA	40.65	NA	
MR-3-02-3345	% Missed Repair Appointment - Central Office					13.79	NA	11.11	NA	
MR-3-03-3345	%CPE/TOK/FOK - Missed Appointment						NA		NA	
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-02-3345	Mean Time To Repair - Loop Trouble					31.35	NA	46.81	NA	
MR-4-03-3345	Mean Time To Repair - Central Office Trouble					15.15	NA	18.36	NA	
MR-4-04-3345	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours					59.06	NA	44.51	NA	
MR-4-07-3345	% Out of Service > 12 Hours					78.36	NA	82.58	NA	
MR-4-08-3345	% Out of Service > 24 Hours					39.55	NA	56.13	NA	
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3345	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days					34.9	NA	36.81	NA	
Special Services - Maintenance										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-01-3200	Network Trouble Report Rate	0.21	2.68	0.23	2.71	0.27	2.11	0.31	2.1	
MR-2-05-3200	% CPE/TOK/FOK Trouble Report Rate	0.33	3.27	0.32	1.98		1.75		1.55	
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-3200	Mean Time To Repair - Total	5.3	6.67	4.7	6.7					
MR-4-04-3200	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	99.41	97.1	99.22	98.67					
MR-4-04-3216	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours - Non DS0 & DS0					96.25	NA	99.22	NA	
MR-4-04-3217	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours - DS1 & DS3					96	98.44	99.39	97.26	
MR-4-06-3200	% Out of Service > 4 Hours	53.37	59.32	48.19	66.67					
MR-4-06-3216	% Out of Service > 4 Hours - Non DS0 & DS0					53.25	NA	53.63	NA	
MR-4-06-3217	% Out of Service > 4 Hours - DS1 & DS3					36	52.63	50	43.75	
MR-4-08-3200	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	0.59	3.39	0.78	1.45					
MR-4-08-3216	% Out of Service > 24 Hours - Non DS0 & DS0					3.75	NA	0.78	NA	
MR-4-06-3217	% Out of Service > 24 Hours - DS1 & DS3					4	1.75	0.61	3.13	

Federal Communications Commission

FCC 02-297

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Reports										
MR-5-01-3200	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	10.85	13.04	11.14	18.67	10.44	15.63	14.73	19.18	
Trunks (Aggregate) - POTS/Special Services										
ORDERING										
OR 1 - Order Confirmation Timeliness										
OR-1-11-5020	Av. FOC Time (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)		4.04		11					
OR-1-11-5030	Av. FOC Time (> 192 and Unforecasted Trunks)		5.42		4.26					
OR-1-12-5020	% On Time FOC (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)		100		75		100		100	2,3
OR-1-12-5030	% On Time FOC (> 192 and Unforecasted Trunks and Projects)		84.62		95.56		98.48		77.78	
OR-1-13-5020	% On Time Design Layout Record (DLR)		100		97.96		100		100	
OR-1-19-5020	% On Time Resp. - Request for Inbound Augment Trunks (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)		100		NA		NA		NA	1
OR-1-19-5030	% On Time Resp. - Request for Inbound Augment Trunks (> 192 Forecasted Trunks)		NA		NA		NA		NA	
OR-2 - Reject Timeliness										
OR-2-11-5000	Average Trunk ASR Reject Time (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)		NA		2					
OR-2-12-5000	% On Time Trunk ASR Reject (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)		NA		100		NA		100	2,4
PROVISIONING										
PR-1 - Average Interval Offered										
PR-1-09-5020	Av. Interval Offered - Total (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)	10.22	6.5	13.11	NA	14.94	NA	11.89	NA	1
PR-1-09-5030	Av. Interval Offered - Total (> 192 & Unforecasted Trunks)	11.24	12.79	12.32	14.76	11.75	11.54	10.7	10.81	
PR-2 - Average Interval Completed										
PR-2-09-5020	Av. Interval Completed - Total (<= 192 Forecasted Trunks)	8.67	6.5	12.57	NA					1
PR-2-09-5030	Av. Interval Completed - Total (> 192 Forecasted Trunks)	11.4	8.33	15.04	13.57					1
PR-4 - Missed Appointment										
PR-4-01-5000	% Missed Appointment - Verizon - Total	0	0	0	0	2.32	0	0.12	0	
PR-4-02-5000	Average Delay Days - Total	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	9	NA	
PR-4-03-5000	% Missed Appointment - Customer	29	40.07	41.18	21.91		68.09		44.15	
PR-4-15-5000	% On Time Provisioning - Trunks						NA		NA	

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
PR-5 - Facility Missed Orders										
PR-5-01-5000	% Missed Appointment – Verizon – Facilities	0	0	0	0	1.93	0	0.12	0	
PR-5-02-5000	% Orders Held for Facilities > 15 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PR-5-03-5000	% Orders Held for Facilities > 60 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PR-6 - Installation Quality										
PR-6-01-5000	% Installation Troubles reported within 30 Days	0	0	0	0	0.03	0.16	0.09	0.03	
PR-6-03-5000	% Inst. Troubles reported within 30 Days - FOK/TOK/CPE	0	0	0	0		0		0.19	
PR-8 - Open Orders in a Hold Status										
PR-8-01-5000	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 30 Days	0	0	0.09	0	0.06	0	1.44	0	
PR-8-02-5000	Open Orders in a Hold Status > 90 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MAINTENANCE										
MR-2 - Trouble Report Rate										
MR-2-01-5000	Network Trouble Report Rate	0.02	0.01	0.03	0	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	
MR-4 - Trouble Duration Intervals										
MR-4-01-5000	Mean Time To Repair – Total	1.79	1.67	4.13	6.29	2.84	2.28	2.11	5.8	
MR-4-04-5000	% Cleared (all troubles) within 24 Hours	100	100	98.63	100	100	100	100	95.24	
MR-4-05-5000	% Out of Service > 2 Hours	29.51	36.36	47.95	88.89	41.18	61.54	18.64	42.86	
MR-4-06-5000	% Out of Service > 4 Hours	6.56	9.09	27.4	44.44	13.73	7.69	11.86	38.1	
MR-4-07-5000	% Out of Service > 12 Hours	1.64	0	5.48	22.22	3.92	0	5.08	19.05	
MR-4-08-5000	% Out of Service > 24 Hours	0	0	1.37	0	0	0	0	4.76	
MR-5 - Repeat Trouble Report Rates										
MR-5-01-5000	% Repeat Reports within 30 Days	8.2	0	8.22	11.11	19.61	0	25.42	9.52	
NETWORK PERFORMANCE										
NP-1 - Percent Final Trunk Group Blockage										
NP-1-01-5000	% Final Trunk Groups Exceeding Blocking Standard	0.97	1.08	0.94	2.22	1.88	2.15	1.87	2.13	
NP-1-02-5000	% FTG Exceeding Blocking Std. -(No Exceptions)	0.97	9.68	0.94	10	1.88	12.9	1.87	5.32	
NP-2 - Collocation Performance - New										
NP-2-01L6701	% On Time Response to Request for Physical Collocation		100		100		NA		NA	1,2
NP-2-02-6701	% On Time Response to Request for Virtual Collocation		NA		NA		NA		100	4
NP-2-03-6701	Average Interval - Physical Collocation		75.67		75.7s		NA		64.5	

VIRGINIA PERFORMANCE METRIC DATA

Metric Number	Metric Name	April		May		June		July		Notes
		VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	VZ	CLEC	
NP-2-04-6701	Average Interval – Virtual Collocation		NA		NA		NA		NA	
NP-2-05-6701	% On Time – Physical Collocation		100		100		NA		100	2,4
NP-2-06-6701	% On Time – Virtual Collocation		NA		NA		NA		NA	
NP-2-07-6701	Average Delay Days – Physical Collocation		NA		NA		NA		NA	
NP-2-08-6701	Average Delay Days – Virtual Collocation		NA		NA		NA		NA	
NP-2 - Collocation Performance - Augment										
NP-2-01-6702	% On Time Response to Request for Physical Collocation		100		100		NA		100	1,2
NP-2-02-6702	% On Time Response to Request for Virtual Collocation		100		NA		NA		100	1,4
NP-2-03-6702	Average Interval – Physical Collocation - 76 days		68.18		74.57		NA		70.44	
NP-2-03-6712	Average Interval – Physical Collocation - 45 days						NA		NA	
NP-2-04-6702	Average Interval – Virtual Collocation		55.5		NA		NA		38	
NP-2-05-6702	% On Time – Physical Collocation - 76 days		100		100		NA		100	
NP-2-05-6712	% On Time – Physical Collocation - 45 days						NA		NA	
NP-2-06-6702	% On Time – Virtual Collocation		100		NA		NA		100	1,4
NP-2-07-6702	Average Delay Days – Physical Collocation		NA		NA		NA		NA	
NP-2-08-6702	Average Delay Days – Virtual Collocation		NA		NA		NA		NA	

Abbreviations: NA = No Activity.

UD = Under Development.

blank cell = No data provided.

VZ = Verizon retail analog. If no data was provided, the metric may have a benchmark.

Notes:

1 = Sample Size under 10 for April.

2 = Sample Size under 10 for May.

3 = Sample Size under 10 for June.

4 = Sample Size under 10 for July.

Appendix C Statutory Requirements

I. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

1. The 1996 Act conditions BOC entry into the market for provision of in-region interLATA services on compliance with certain provisions of section 271.¹ BOCs must apply to the Federal Communications Commission (Commission or FCC) for authorization to provide interLATA services originating in any in-region state.² The Commission must issue a written determination on each application no later than 90 days after receiving such application.³ Section 271(d)(2)(A) requires the Commission to consult with the Attorney General before making any determination approving or denying a section 271 application. The Attorney General is entitled to evaluate the application “using any standard the Attorney General considers appropriate,” and the Commission is required to “give substantial weight to the Attorney General’s evaluation.”⁴

2. In addition, the Commission must consult with the relevant state commission to verify that the BOC has one or more state-approved interconnection agreements with a facilities-based competitor, or a Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions (SGAT), and that either the agreement(s) or general statement satisfy the “competitive checklist.”⁵ Because the Act does not prescribe any standard for the consideration of a state commission’s verification under section 271(d)(2)(B), the Commission has discretion in each section 271 proceeding to determine

¹ For purposes of section 271 proceedings, the Commission uses the definition of the term “Bell Operating Company” contained in 47 U.S.C. § 153(4).

² 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(1). For purposes of section 271 proceedings, the Commission utilizes the definition of the term “in-region state” that is contained in 47 U.S.C. § 271(i)(1). Section 271(j) provides that a BOC’s in-region services include 800 service, private line service, or their equivalents that terminate in an in-region state of that BOC and that allow the called party to determine the interLATA carrier, even if such services originate out-of-region. *Id.* § 271(j). The 1996 Act defines “interLATA services” as “telecommunications between a point located in a local access and transport area and a point located outside such area.” *Id.* § 153(21). Under the 1996 Act, a “local access and transport area” (LATA) is “a contiguous geographic area (A) established before the date of enactment of the [1996 Act] by a [BOC] such that no exchange area includes points within more than 1 metropolitan statistical area, consolidated metropolitan statistical area, or State, except as expressly permitted under the AT&T Consent Decree; or (B) established or modified by a [BOC] after such date of enactment and approved by the Commission.” *Id.* § 153(25). LATAs were created as part of the Modification of Final Judgment’s (MFJ) “plan of reorganization.” *United States v. Western Elec. Co.*, 569 F. Supp. 1057 (D.D.C. 1983), *aff’d sub nom. California v. United States*, 461 U.S. 1013 (1983). Pursuant to the MFJ, “all [BOC] territory in the continental United States [was] divided into LATAs, generally centering upon a city or other identifiable community of interest.” *United States v. Western Elec. Co.*, 569 F. Supp. 990, 993-94 (D.D.C. 1983).

³ 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)

⁴ *Id.* § 271(d)(2)(A).

⁵ *Id.* § 271(d)(2)(B)

the amount of weight to accord the state commission's verification.⁶ The Commission has held that, although it will consider carefully state determinations of fact that are supported by a detailed and extensive record, it is the FCC's role to determine whether the factual record supports the conclusion that particular requirements of section 271 have been met.⁷

3. Section 271 requires the Commission *to* make various findings before approving BOC entry. In order for the Commission to approve a BOC's application to provide in-region, interLATA services, a BOC must first demonstrate, with respect to each state for which it seeks authorization, that it satisfies the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) (Track A) or 271(c)(1)(B) (Track B).⁸ In order to obtain authorization under section 271, the BOC must also show that: (1) it has "fully implemented the competitive checklist" contained in section 271(c)(2)(B);⁹ (2) the requested authorization will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of section 272;¹⁰ and (3) the BOC's entry into the in-region interLATA market is "consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity."¹¹ The statute specifies that, unless the Commission finds that these criteria have been satisfied, the Commission "shall not approve" the requested authorization.¹²

⁶ *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3962, para. 20; *Application of Ameritech Michigan Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, CC Docket No. 97-137, 12 FCC Rcd 20543, 20559-60 (1997) (*Ameritech Michigan Order*). As the D.C. Circuit has held, "[a]lthough the Commission must consult with the state commissions, the statute does not require the Commission to give State Commissions' views any particular weight." *SBC Communications Inc. v. FCC*, 138 F.3d 410, 416 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

⁷ *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20560; *SBC Communications v. FCC*, 138 F.3d at 416-17.

⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A). See Section 111, *infra*, for a complete discussion of Track A and Track B requirements.

⁹ *Id.* §§ 271(c)(2)(B), 271(d)(3)(A)(i).

¹⁰ *Id.* § 272; see *Implementation of the Non-Accounting Safeguards of Sections 271 and 272 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended*, CC Docket No. 96-149, First Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 21905 (1996) (*Non-Accounting Safeguards Order*), recon., Order on Reconsideration, 12 FCC Rcd 2297 (1997), review pending sub nom., *SBC Communications v. FCC*, No. 97-1118 (D.C. Cir., filed Mar. 6, 1997) (held in abeyance pursuant to court order filed May 7, 1997), remanded *in part* sub nom., *Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies v. FCC*, No. 97-1067 (D.C. Cir., filed Mar. 31, 1997), on remand, Second Order on Reconsideration, FCC 97-222 (rel. June 24, 1997), petition for review denied sub nom. *Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies v. FCC*, 113 F.3d 1044 (D.C. Cir. 1997); *Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 17539 (1996).

¹¹ 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(C).

¹² *Id.* § 271(d)(3); see *SBC Communications, Inc. v. FCC*, 138 F.3d at 416.

II. PROCEDURAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

4. To determine whether a BOC applicant has met the prerequisites for entry into the long distance market, the Commission evaluates its compliance with the competitive checklist, as developed in the FCC's local competition rules and orders in effect at the time the application was filed. Despite the comprehensiveness of these rules, there will inevitably be, in any section 271 proceeding, disputes over an incumbent LEC's precise obligations to its competitors that FCC rules have not addressed and that do not involve *per se* violations of self-executing requirements of the Act. As explained in prior orders, the section 271 process simply could not function as Congress intended if the Commission were required to resolve all such disputes as a precondition to granting a section 271 application." In the context of section 271's adjudicatory framework, the Commission has established certain procedural rules governing BOC section 271 applications." The Commission has explained in prior orders the procedural rules it has developed to facilitate the review process." Here we describe how the Commission considers the evidence of compliance that the BOC presents in its application.

5. As part of the determination that a BOC has satisfied the requirements of section 271, the Commission considers whether the BOC has fully implemented the competitive checklist in subsection (c)(2)(B). The BOC at all times bears the burden of proof of compliance with section 271, even if no party challenges its compliance with a particular requirement." In demonstrating its compliance, a BOC must show that it has a concrete and specific legal obligation to furnish the item upon request pursuant to state-approved interconnection agreements that set forth prices and other terms and conditions for each checklist item, and that it is currently furnishing, or is ready to furnish, the checklist items in quantities that competitors may reasonably demand and at an acceptable level of quality." In particular, the BOC must demonstrate that it is offering interconnection and access to network elements on a

¹³ See *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6246, para. 19; see also *American Tel. & Tel. Co. v. FCC*, 220 F.3d 607, 631 (D.C.Cir. 2000).

¹⁴ See *Procedures for Bell Operating Company Applications Under New Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, 11 FCC Rcd 19708, 19711 (1996); *Revised Comment Schedule For Ameritech Michigan Application, as amended, for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region. InterLATA Services in the State of Michigan*, Public Notice, DA 97-127 (rel. Jan. 17, 1997); *Revised Procedures for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, 13 FCC Rcd 17451 (1997); *Updated Filing Requirements for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, DA 99-1994 (rel. Sept. 28, 1999); *Updated Filing Requirements for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act*, Public Notice, DA 01-734 (CCB rel. Mar. 23, 2001) (collectively "271 Procedural Public Notices").

¹⁵ See, e.g., *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order* 16 FCC Rcd at 6247-50, paras. 21-27; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18370-73, paras. 34-42; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3968-71, paras. 32-42.

¹⁶ See *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18374, para. 46; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3972, para. 46.

¹⁷ See *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3973-74, para. 52.

nondiscriminatory basis.” Previous Commission orders addressing section 271 applications have elaborated on this statutory standard.¹⁹ First, for those functions the BOC provides to competing carriers that are analogous to the functions a BOC provides to itself in connection with its own retail service offerings, the BOC must provide access to competing carriers in “substantially the same time and manner” as it provides to itself.” Thus, where a retail analogue exists, a BOC must provide access that is equal to (i.e., substantially the same as) the level of access that the BOC provides itself, its customers, or its affiliates, in terms of quality, accuracy, and timeliness.²¹ For those functions that have no retail analogue, the BOC must demonstrate that the access it provides to competing carriers would offer an efficient carrier a “meaningful opportunity to compete.””

6. The determination of whether the statutory standard is met is ultimately a judgment the Commission must make based on its expertise in promoting competition in local markets and in telecommunications regulation generally.²³ The Commission has not established, nor does it believe it appropriate to establish, specific objective criteria for what constitutes “substantially the same time and manner” or a “meaningful opportunity to compete.”” Whether this legal standard is met can only be decided based on an analysis of specific facts and circumstances. Therefore, the Commission looks at each application on a case-by-case basis and considers the totality of the circumstances, including the origin and quality of the information in the record, to determine whether the nondiscrimination requirements of the Act are met.

A. Performance Data

7. As established in prior section 271 orders, the Commission has found that performance measurements provide valuable evidence regarding a BOC’s compliance or noncompliance with individual checklist items. The Commission expects that, in its *prima facie* case in the initial application, a BOC relying on performance data will:

¹⁸ See 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(i), (ii).

¹⁹ See *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6250-51, paras. 28-29; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3971-72, paras. 44-46.

²⁰ *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18373, para. 44; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3971, para. 44.

²¹ *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3971, para. 44; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20618-19.

²² *Id.*

²³ *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18374, para. 46; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3972, para. 46.

- a) provide sufficient performance data to support its contention that the statutory requirements are satisfied;
- b) identify the facial disparities between the applicant's performance for itself and its performance for competitors;
- c) explain why those facial disparities are anomalous, caused by forces beyond the applicant's control (e.g., competing carrier-caused errors), or have no meaningful adverse impact on a competing carrier's ability to obtain and serve customers; and
- d) provide the underlying data, analysis, and methodologies necessary to enable the Commission and commenters meaningfully to evaluate and contest the validity of the applicant's explanations for performance disparities, including, for example, carrier specific carrier-to-carrier performance data.

8. The Commission has explained in prior orders that parity and benchmark standards established by state commissions do not represent absolute maximum or minimum levels of performance necessary to satisfy the competitive checklist. Rather, where these standards are developed through open proceedings with input from both the incumbent and competing carriers, these standards can represent informed and reliable attempts to objectively approximate whether competing carriers are being served by the incumbent in substantially the same time and manner, or in a way that provides them a meaningful opportunity to compete.²⁵ Thus, to the extent there is no statistically significant difference between a BOC's provision of service to competing carriers and its own retail customers, the Commission generally need not look any further. Likewise, if a BOC's provision of service to competing carriers satisfies the performance benchmark, the analysis *is* usually done. Otherwise, the Commission will examine the evidence further to make a determination whether the statutory nondiscrimination requirements are met." Thus, the Commission will examine the explanations that a BOC and others provide about whether these data accurately depict the quality of the BOC's performance. The Commission also may examine how many months a variation in performance has existed and what the recent trend has been. The Commission may find that statistically significant differences exist, but conclude that such differences have little or no competitive significance in the marketplace. In such cases, the Commission may conclude that the differences are not meaningful in terms of statutory compliance. Ultimately, the determination of whether a BOC's performance meets the statutory requirements necessarily is a contextual decision based **on** the totality of the circumstances and information before the Commission.

9. Where there are multiple performance measures associated with a particular checklist item, the Commission would consider the performance demonstrated by all the measurements as a whole. Accordingly, a disparity in performance for one measure, **by** itself,

²⁵

See *SWBT Kansas/Oklahoma Order*, 16 FCC Rcd at 6252, para. 31; *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18377, para. 55 & n.102.

²⁶

See *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3970, para. 59.

may not provide a basis for finding noncompliance with the checklist. The Commission may also find that the reported performance data are affected by factors beyond a BOC's control, a finding that would make it less likely to hold the BOC wholly accountable for the disparity. This is not to say, however, that performance discrepancies on a single performance metric are unimportant. Indeed, under certain circumstances, disparity with respect to one performance measurement may support a finding of statutory noncompliance, particularly if the disparity is substantial or has endured for a long time, or if it is accompanied by other evidence of discriminatory conduct or evidence that competing carriers have been denied a meaningful opportunity to compete.

10. In sum, the Commission does not use performance measurements as a substitute for the 14-point competitive checklist. Rather, it uses performance measurements as valuable evidence with which to inform the judgment as to whether a BOC has complied with the checklist requirements. Although performance measurements add necessary objectivity and predictability to the review, they cannot wholly replace the Commission's own judgment as to whether a BOC has complied with the competitive checklist.

B. Relevance of Previous Section 271 Approvals

11. In some section 271 applications, the volumes of the BOC's commercial orders may be significantly lower than they were in prior proceedings. In certain instances, volumes may be so low as to render the performance data inconsistent and inconclusive.²⁷ Performance data based on low volumes of orders or other transactions are not as reliable an indicator of checklist compliance as performance based on larger numbers of observations. Indeed, where performance data are based on a low number of observations, small variations in performance may produce wide swings in the reported performance data. It is thus not possible to place the same evidentiary weight upon – and to draw the same types of conclusions from – performance data where volumes are low, as for data based on more robust activity.

12. In such cases, findings in prior, related section 271 proceedings may be a relevant factor in the Commission's analysis. Where a BOC provides evidence that a particular system reviewed and approved in a prior section 271 proceeding is also used in the proceeding at hand, the Commission's review of the same system in the current proceeding will be informed by the findings in the prior one. Indeed, to the extent that issues have already been briefed, reviewed and resolved in a prior section 271 proceeding, and absent new evidence or changed circumstances, an application for a related state should not be a forum for re-litigating and reconsidering those issues. Appropriately employed, such a practice can give us a fuller picture of the BOC's compliance with the section 271 requirements while avoiding, for all parties

²⁷ The Commission has never required, however, an applicant to demonstrate that it processes and provisions a substantial commercial volume of orders, or has achieved a specific market share in its service area, as a prerequisite for satisfying the competitive checklist. See *Ameritech Michigan* Order, 12 FCC Rcd at 20585, para. 77 (explaining that Congress had considered and rejected language that would have imposed a "market share" requirement in section 271(c)(1)(A)).

involved in the section 271 process, the delay and expense associated with redundant and unnecessary proceedings and submissions.

13. However, the statute requires the Commission to make a separate determination of checklist compliance for each state and, accordingly, we do not consider any finding from previous section 271 orders to be dispositive of checklist compliance in current proceedings. While the Commission's review may be informed by prior findings, the Commission will consider all relevant evidence in the record, including state-specific factors identified by commenting parties, the states, the Department of Justice. However, the Commission has always held that an applicant's performance towards competing carriers in an actual commercial environment is the best evidence of nondiscriminatory access to OSS and other network elements.²⁸ Thus, the BOC's actual performance in the applicant state may be relevant to the analysis and determinations with respect to the 14 checklist items. Evidence of satisfactory performance in another state cannot trump convincing evidence that an applicant fails to provide nondiscriminatory access to a network element in the applicant state.

14. Moreover, because the Commission's review of a section 271 application must be based on a snapshot of a BOC's recent performance at the time an application is filed, the Commission cannot simply rely on findings relating to an applicant's performance in an anchor state at the time it issued the determination for that state. The performance in that state could change due to a multitude of factors, such as increased order volumes or shifts in the mix of the types of services or UNEs requested by competing carriers. Thus, even when the applicant makes a convincing showing of the relevance of anchor state data, the Commission must examine how recent performance in that state compares to performance at the time it approved that state's section 271 application, in order to determine if the systems and processes continue to perform at acceptable levels.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH ENTRY REQUIREMENTS – SECTIONS 271(c)(1)(A) & 271(c)(1)(B)

15. As noted above, in order for the Commission to approve a BOC's application to provide in-region, interLATA services, a BOC must first demonstrate that it satisfies the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) (Track **A**) or 271(c)(1)(B) (Track **B**).²⁹ To qualify for Track **A**, a BOC must have interconnection agreements with one or more competing providers of "telephone exchange service . . . to residential and business subscribers."³⁰ The Act states that "such telephone service may *be* offered . . . either exclusively over [the competitor's] own telephone exchange service facilities or predominantly over [the competitor's] own telephone exchange facilities in combination with the resale of the telecommunications services of another

²⁸ See *SWBT Texas Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 18376, para. 53; *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3974, para. 53.

²⁹ See 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A)

³⁰ *Id*

carrier.”” The Commission concluded in the *Ameritech Michigan Order* that section 271(c)(1)(A) is satisfied if one or more competing providers collectively serve residential and business subscribers.”

16. As an alternative to Track A, Section 271(c)(1)(B) permits BOCs to obtain authority to provide in-region, interLATA services if, after 10 months from the date of enactment, no facilities-based provider, as described in subparagraph (A), has requested the access and interconnection arrangements described therein (referencing one or more binding agreements approved under Section 252), but the state has approved an SGAT that satisfies the competitive checklist of subsection (c)(2)(B). Under section 271(d)(3)(A)(ii), the Commission shall not approve such a request for in-region, interLATA service unless the BOC demonstrates that, “with respect to access and interconnection generally offered pursuant to [an SGAT], such statement offers all of the items included in the competitive checklist.”” Track B, however, is not available to a BOC if it has already received a request for access and interconnection from a prospective competing provider of telephone exchange service.”

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST –SECTION 271(c)(2)(B)

A. Checklist Item 1 – Interconnection

17. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Act requires a section 271 applicant to provide “[i]nterconnection in accordance with the requirements of sections 251(c)(2) and 252(d)(1).”³⁵ Section 251(c)(2) imposes a duty on incumbent LECs “to provide, for the facilities and equipment of any requesting telecommunications carrier, interconnection with the local exchange carrier’s network . . . for the transmission and routing of telephone exchange service and exchange access.”” In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the Commission concluded that interconnection referred “only to the physical linking of two networks for the

³¹ *Id.*

³² See *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20589, para. 85; see also Second *BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20633-35, paras. 46-48.

³³ 47 U.S.C. § 271(d)(3)(A)(ii)

³⁴ See *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20561-62, para. 34. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned foreclosure of Track B as an option is subject to limited exceptions. See 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(1)(B); see also *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20563-64, paras. 37-38.

³⁵

47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(2)(B)(i); see *Bell Atlantic New York Order*, 15 FCC Rcd at 3977-78, para. 63; Second *BellSouth Louisiana Order*, 13 FCC Rcd at 20640, para. 61; *Ameritech Michigan Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 20662, para. 222.

³⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(2)(A).